

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 170 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 170

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered by title rather than by paragraph. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2, 5(b), or 6 of rule XXI are waived. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution in the order printed. Each of those amendments may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in part 1 of the report are waived. After disposition of the amendments printed in part 1 of the report, the provisions of the bill as then perfected shall be considered as original text. Points of order against amendments printed in part of the report under clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. An amendment printed in part 2 of the report shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. During further consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] pending which I

yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO OFFER AMENDMENTS IN MODIFIED FORM

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] be permitted to offer either of his amendments numbered 1 or 2 in House Report 104-147 which accompanies House Resolution 170, to the bill H.R. 1868 in the modified form which Representative HALL has placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I would like to explain this request.

The unanimous consent will simply correct a technical and clerical error that occurred at the Legislative Counsel's office in the drafting of my amendments, which appear as amendments number 1 and number 2. An incorrect number was picked up from line 14, page 22, of H.R. 1868. As a result, the corrected numbers in the Hall amendment are \$2,326,700,000 and \$2,300,000,000 respectively. This is a technical error.

□ 1545

It will not change the thrust of the amendments, and I still only intend to offer one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the technical amendment only in the Hall amendment and no other portion?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. That is the only part of the unanimous-consent request that I have presently on the floor on which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] reserved the right to object.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule to the floor today. While it is not a remarkable rule, it does share certain qualities with most of the rules of the new majority that we have reported this year.

First, it is open. It has a very limited number of specific waivers, and it is fair to both sides of the aisle.

Specifically, the rule for the foreign operations bill accomplishes several

things. First, it is an open rule, allowing any Member to offer an amendment that is in order under the standing rules of the House. In fact, this rule does go a little bit beyond that, allowing for debate on four separate amendments, two Democratic amendments and two Republican amendments, that might not be allowed under a regular rule, might not, I say, because we are not entirely sure of the parliamentary rulings on all of them.

There are only three specific waivers given to the bill for unauthorized appropriations, reappropriations, and for a technical trade provision.

The first two are needed because there has not been a foreign operations authorization bill that has made it into law since 1985, as just about everybody knows. This year the House passed an authorizing bill. We have done our work, and it is worth noting the Committee on Appropriations has worked closely with the Committee on International Relations to ensure this bill is in line with the House-passed authorization.

The last technical waiver I mentioned is required because the bill contains a provision expanding the President's existing authority to impose trade sanctions to Iraq, Serbia, and Montenegro. While this provision is included in the bill for very sound foreign policy reasons, trade issues fall under the primary jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Therefore, this section needs a waiver from clause 5(b) of rule XXI.

As in previous rules this year, we have included a preprinting option, I stress the word "option," for priority and recognition.

And, finally, this rule provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, as we discussed in the Committee on Rules hearing yesterday, it is important for this House to have a full and complete debate over the issue of foreign aid especially over the true amount of tax dollars involved and the policies that drive these expenditures. I am pleased that this rule allows for this debate, and I look forward to it.

This year's foreign aid rule is, in many ways, a tremendous improvement over previous bills. To begin with, it is \$1.6 billion below last year's bill and \$2.8 billion below the President's requests. Those are significant amounts of money, and, in my view, they are responsible cuts that represent the kind of spending reform that is necessary to achieve the balanced budget we set out to do.

In addition, there is much greater accountability for the funds spent under this bill. Americans have demanded that. And we make these two issues, affordability and accountability, our top priority in any foreign aid bill, and I think we have done that pretty well here.

We are now down to less than 1 percent of the budget for foreign aid, something under \$12 billion.

There is one area in which I would like to see even greater accountability, however, and that is aid to the Government of Haiti. The Clinton administration has committed an enormous amount of taxpayers' dollars to Haiti, actually without much explanation or accounting so far. There is an important pair of elections scheduled for this

calendar year, elections for Haiti's parliament this weekend and the Presidential in December of this year.

I plan to offer an amendment that will require that before United States dollars are sent to Haiti, those elections be conducted in a democratic and constitutional manner. This will provide greater accountability for the foreign aid dollars that are spent in Haiti

and ensure that they are utilized to enhance democracy and provide a real incentive to Haiti to stay on the road to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the rule before us today is both fair and open. It was voted out of our committee on a voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 20, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	30	73
Modified Closed ³	49	47	11	27
Closed ⁴	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	41	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be pre-printed in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 12, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1.	Balanced Budget Amdt.	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif.	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/1/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt.	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O=open rule; MO=modified open rule; MC=modified closed rule; C=closed rule; A=adoption vote; PQ=previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague has described, House Resolution 170 is essentially an open rule. It provides 1 hour of general debate on the foreign operations appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996.

The rule does provide waivers of clause 2 of rule XXI, to allow unauthor-

ized appropriations provisions in the bill, as well as clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations in some provisions.

The rule does reflect an agreement between the authorizing committee and the appropriators by making in order two amendments to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule also makes in order my children's amendment, which is called the Hall amendment, to transfer \$108 million in funds to the new child survival

fund and to include basic education activities for millions of poor children overseas.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the members of the Republicans and the Democrats on the Committee on Rules for making this in order. I appreciate that.

Other amendments allowed under the rule include one by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] on Cuba, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] on Haiti, and under the normal amending process in the House, any

other amendment which does not violate House rules will be in order under this rule.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I do support this rule, I have some misgivings about the bill as it currently stands. As I indicated during the debate on the American Overseas Interest Act, the international affairs budget represents only 1.3 percent of total Federal spending. It has already been cut by 40 percent since 1985, and under this bill the fund for Africa absorbs a 34-percent cut and another 40 percent is squeezed out of development aid. Funds in these areas go for self-help, preventive programs which alleviate more money down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the Committee on Rules was able to make the Hall amendment, which is my amendment, in order to transfer \$108 million in funds to the new child survival and disease programs fund. This fund is created to take care of vital child survival and disease prevention activities that alleviate malnutrition and death among the world's poorest children.

My amendment will also allow basic education programs to be funded through this new children's account.

Disease and malnutrition and basic education are the core of self-sufficiency, and without a renewed emphasis on these kinds of programs, we cannot expect people to raise themselves out of poverty or improve their situations. For each additional year of schooling children from developing countries receive, their incomes rise as much as 10 percent.

My amendment pays for itself by transferring small amounts from other foreign aid programs that can absorb the cuts.

And finally, in the Committee on Rules hearing, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] did request an amendment known as the deficit reduction lockbox amendment. This would have allowed any savings obtained from floor votes to go into a special deficit reduction trust fund. Given the interest many of us have in deficit reduction, I believe the Committee on Rules should have made the Brewster amendment in order.

My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILSONSON] did offer the lockbox measure as an amendment to the rule, but, unfortunately, it failed.

I plan to support the rule. I think it is a good rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, formerly of Okeechobee, FL.

Mr. SOLOMON. As a matter of fact, I will be down near there this weekend.

Let me say the two speakers, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], have accurately described this rule as being fair and open, and it is.

It allows Republicans and Democrats, it allows liberals, conservatives, anybody else, the right to come on this floor and work their will. That is the way it should be. I will not go into that any further.

Let me just say this appropriations bill itself represents yet another installment in our march towards a balancing of the Federal budget. That, to me, means so much. It means that the total appropriation in this bill is almost 20-percent below the administration's request, and more than that, it is almost 12-percent below the appropriated level from fiscal year 1995. And that is the only way that we are ever going to balance the budget. We have to spend less this year than we spent last year, and we have got to continue to do that year in and year out at least for 7 years. I wish it could be sooner.

The truth of the matter is we are following the Ronald Reagan philosophy. He said that instead of giving people fish and foreign aid, we ought to teach them how to fish, and that is exactly what this bill does. Otherwise, we have to keep giving them fish year in and year out. This way, let us teach them how to fish. That is what we are doing in restructuring our foreign aid programs, as well as the domestic programs.

So I commend the sponsors of this legislation on the Committee on Appropriations for a job well done, and I hope that everybody votes for this fair rule and then for the bill itself.

It will be the first appropriations bill on foreign operations that I have ever voted for, and that is because it begins to turn things around and reduce the Federal deficit.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply observe, with respect to the statement by the gentleman from New York, that the foreign aid bills for the last 10 years have reduced the level of foreign assistance. They used to be \$18 billion, and in the last decade they have been brought down to \$13 billion. So this is not, by any means, the first foreign assistance bill which was lower than the previous year. We have had that occur on a number of occasions during the years that I have chaired that subcommittee.

Let me say that I have opposed the authorization bill because I felt that it represents some of the most incredible micromanagement of foreign assistance in the history of the foreign assistance program, and I think that much of the micromanagement in that bill is idiotic.

But I have been intending to support the appropriation bill because despite the fact that I believe it has a poor allocation of priorities and, despite the reckless manner with which it deals with issues such as NATO and our relationship with the Soviet Union, it does, in fact, not have a lot of the micromanagement that is contained in the authorization bill.

I was informed earlier that it was the intention of the committee not to accept legislative language, save two amendments which everyone understood would be offered, one being the one by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] and the other by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The abortion issue is so contentious that we almost always have an issue like that, and that cannot be avoided.

But there are two other legislative amendments which are now being made in order which have, in my view, no business on an appropriation bill which would tie our entire relationship with the Soviet Union to one narrow question of what happens in Cuba, and another amendment which would tie our entire aid relationship to Haiti to legislative language which I have not even yet had an opportunity to review, let alone staff out.

And so, under these circumstances, what I had thought would be a rule which would be a straight appropriation rule bill, in fact, allow for a number of policy issues which, in my view, properly ought to be debated on the authorization bill and not on the appropriations bill. And because of that, and because I believe that the amendment with respect to our relationship with the Soviet Union further adds to the recklessness with which that issue has generally been dealt with by this committee, I am sorry to say that I will have to oppose the rule and will, in fact, oppose the previous question on the rule and would ask that if the previous question is not approved, that the House support an amendment correcting the fact that there are two legislative amendments on this proposal that do not belong here.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just note in response to the gentleman's comments that one of those amendments was brought forward by a distinguished Member of the gentleman's party, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], and he was treated very fairly. It was thought to be an important amendment.

And the other amendment, the one about Haiti which was brought forward by myself, actually probably does not need protection, because it is a cutting amendment, a limitation amendment, not a legislating amendment, we are told.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART].

□ 1600

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding me this time.

I think it is curious that we just heard that the issue that was made in order by virtue of the Menendez amendment having been made in order by the Committee on Rules, and I am going to try to paraphrase, is a narrow issue that will tie our relationship to

the Soviet Union to an incident or a situation in Cuba.

To call a nuclear power plant that is being built 180 miles from the United States, and that is being built of a model that after the reunification of Germany four nuclear power plants which had been built by the Soviets there of that same model were immediately closed down by the Government of Germany because of their lack of safety, to call the national interests of the United States that that kind of nuclear power plant not be completed 180 miles from our shore a narrow interest is quite a curiosity.

That is precisely, however, why the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] came before the Committee on Rules, because of the grave nature of the threat to the U.S. national security that would ensue if this nuclear power plant were completed.

That is why the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] came before the Committee on Rules and asked we make in order, and we did, his amendment which will simply say to Russia that, if they contribute to the completion of that nuclear power plant 180 miles from the United States in Cuba, that the amount that Russia contributes to that nuclear power plant's completion on a dollar-for-dollar basis will be deducted from United States taxpayer assistance to Russia.

Now that is not, Mr. Speaker, I would maintain, nor did the majority of the Committee on Rules maintain, a narrow interest. It is the national security interests of the United States being protected by this Congress in making sure that we make the strongest possible statement to Russia that we will not accept a VVER, a VVER model nuclear power plant being completed a hundred 180 miles from the soil of the United States.

Now in Europe the entire environmental movement is mobilized at this point to close down the other VVER power plants that are still in operation throughout Eastern Europe that the Soviets had constructed, and they are able to close them down. They have been able to close already all of them down in Germany, and they are making substantial progress in closing down the other ones.

This is not a narrow interest. This is something that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] I think brought forth very correctly, and I think he has to be commended for bringing it forth in this bill as an amendment. He brought it to our attention in the Committee in Rules, and we made it in order, as we made in order the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] that, if we are going to send taxpayer dollars to Haiti, that they have to have free elections.

Now I think it would be really an extreme absurdity if we were going to continue to send U.S. taxpayer dollars to Haiti if a government there, whatever the government is, proceeds to steal elections.

So that is all we are saying, and it is not a narrow interest. It is something that is in our national interest. It is something that is in our national interest, and that is why, despite the possible, the possible allegations that some points of order could conceivably, and we are not sure, be made with regard to those amendments, the Committee on Rules made them in order.

It is a good rule, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask for my colleagues' support of this fair rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that I agree with both gentlemen on substance; I agree with the previous speaker. I do not want to see that reactor built in Cuba either. I think it is an idiotic, asinine, and stupid thing for the Soviets to do, and I think we ought to do everything possible to stop it.

The question is whether the method chosen by the gentleman is the most effective way to accomplish that end, and I do not believe it is, and that is the simple issue here.

I do not want for one moment for anyone to believe that I do not agree with both gentlemen with respect to their policy positions on either Haiti or with respect to that reactor. I say to them, "I agree with you on both of them. I do, however, have substantial question about whether or not the method you have chosen to try to accomplish that purpose will do it."

I, in fact, think it may have the opposite reaction, and that is one reason why I believe that on short order, on the basis of a very brief discussion in the Committee on Rules, this amendment should not have been made in order, because frankly I do not think the Congress at this point knows what it is doing on either one of these subjects.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] so he may respond to that.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for these 2 minutes. I do not think I will need 2 minutes. I just want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for his support on the substantive issue.

I say to the gentleman, "If over and above our efforts you have further suggestions, we are more than open to receive your suggestions on how to make sure that those powerplants won't be completed in Cuba and how to make sure that democracy is continued and furthered and protected in Haiti. We happen to believe that this is not only an appropriate vehicle, but a most appropriate vehicle to put maximum pressure on both of these situations with regard to the national interests of the United States, but if over and above these efforts you have additional suggestions, we will be more than open to review them and hopefully work together with you."

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that the original sponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], is a Democrat, and certainly the gentleman from Florida is a Republican, and so am I. But we all had interest in this because time is critical right now.

As a matter of fact, the truth of the matter is we delayed the markup of this rule in the Committee on Rules in order to go back to the Appropriations Committee, both sides of the aisle, staff on the Democrat side and Republican side, to find out if perhaps there was a better way or perhaps other suggestions. We did change it based on their recommendations.

So we have done everything we could. If the gentleman has a better way, we will consider that, too.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, he keeps indicating that one of the authors of one of the amendments was a Democrat. It is immaterial to me whether it comes from either side, which side of the aisle it comes from. The fact is our committee knows about as much about that subject as the gentleman can put in his left ear. It ought to be handled by the authorizing committee.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has been around here for 20 years. He is probably one of the most knowledgeable Members on the subject of foreign affairs, and I have praised him to the sky for many years.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, we do not want these—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has expired.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. BEILENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much my colleague and friend yielding so much time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in mild opposition to the rule and in strong opposition to the bill that it would make in order, the fiscal 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, what is at stake in this bill is nothing less than the future of America's leadership in the world. While we need to cut Federal spending, we ought to be extremely concerned about the potentially disastrous effects the spending cuts in this bill will have on U.S. influence abroad, on our ability to protect our national interests, and on the lives of hundreds of millions of people in the developing world.

The bill cuts foreign aid by \$1.6 billion below this year's level, a level that already reflects a vastly reduced foreign aid budget compared to that of, say, 10 years ago when Ronald Reagan was President. In 1985, the United States spent \$18.1 billion on foreign aid. This year we are spending just \$13.5 billion, a 25 percent reduction, not adjusted for inflation. Adjusted for inflation is closer to 40 to 45 percent.

One of the great myths that has been perpetrated in the media is that the Federal Government spends a significant portion of its budget on foreign aid. Indeed, in a recent study three of four Americans said they believe the United States spends too much on foreign aid. But when asked how much they thought the Nation spends, the median response was 15 percent of the Federal budget. And when respondents were asked how much the United States should spend on foreign aid, the median response was 5 percent, with most agreeing that 3 percent would be too little.

As we all know, U.S. foreign aid is actually less than 1 percent of the Federal budget. In fact, as a percentage of the our gross national product [GNP], the United States is now the lowest aid contributor of the world's top 23 industrialized nations.

For a minuscule fraction of what we spend on defense, the prudent use of foreign aid helps us meet escalating threats to our national and to global security, including chronic poverty, rapid population growth, environmental degradation, forced migration, and in protecting against political instability in countries that cannot adequately take care of their own people. The long-term effect of the cuts in this bill will be a substantial reduction in the President's ability to conduct foreign policy, leaving him, and leaving us, with only a military option in too many circumstances.

Many people do not realize how much our modest investment in foreign assistance programs benefit U.S. businesses and citizens. When the Marshall plan was announced in 1947, only 18 percent of Americans supported that effort to rebuild Europe. But U.S. assistance helped to establish social and political stability, and created some of our best trading partners and, of course, our most staunch political allies. In the 1960's and 1970's, many criticized United States assistance to countries such as South Korea, Taiwan, Mexico, and India. But once again, U.S. assistance ushered in a period of unprecedented growth in those countries. With United States help, for example, India has seen dramatic increases in agricultural production and, as a consequence partially of our foreign aid, a politically stable India now offers a promising and growing market of more than 900 million people for United States goods.

The fastest-growing segment of the U.S. export market is in trade with developing countries. Today developing

countries import almost 40 percent of U.S. exports, accounting for at least 2 million U.S. American jobs. In the past decade alone, exports to developing countries have more than doubled from \$71 to \$180 billion a year.

The United States is today exporting products and services to many of the nations we were giving assistance to in the 1960's and the 1970's. More than 24 countries since that time have moved from being foreign aid recipients to becoming trading partners with us.

Foreign aid has also dramatically improved the lives of hundreds of millions of people and reduced the risk of, and the occurrence of, humanitarian crises. Since 1960, development assistance has helped reduce infant mortality rates in developing countries by 50 percent, has helped increase life expectancy from 46 years to 63 years, has helped increase primary school enrollment from 48 percent to 78 percent. Foreign aid has resulted in important breakthroughs in agriculture; investments made by the United States in better seeds and agriculture techniques has helped make it possible to feed an extra billion people in the developing world.

More than 50 million couples in the developing world use family planning as a direct result of U.S. assistance for overseas family planning services. Over the past 35 years, the average number of children per family in the world has been reduced by one-third, from six children to four.

U.S. aid is largely credited with fully immunizing 80 percent of all children in developing countries, eradicating smallpox worldwide, and virtually eliminating polio in the Western hemisphere.

And, since 1980—in just the past 15 years—U.S. foreign assistance has helped three dozen nations make the transition to democratic governance. The spending reductions in this bill threaten to reverse these positive trends, especially as the number of poor around the world, currently an estimated 1.3 billion people, continues to soar.

One area of particular concern to me in this bill is the nearly 50-percent cut in funding for our efforts to stabilize global population growth, which underlies virtually every developmental, environmental, and national security problem facing the world today.

Global population is now nearly 5.7 billion people, and it is growing by almost 100 million every year—by 260,000 every 24 hours. Future prospects, moreover, are even more staggering. If effective action is not taken in the next few years—as today's 1.6 billion children in the developing world under the age of 15, reach their childbearing years—the earth's population could nearly quadruple to 20 billion people by the end of the coming century.

□ 1615

In much of the developing world, high birth rates caused largely by the

lack of access of women to basic reproductive health services and information, are contributing to intractable poverty, malnutrition, widespread unemployment, urban overcrowding, and the rapid spread of disease. Population control growth is outstripping the capacity of many nations to make even modest gains in economic development, leading to political instability and negating other U.S. and other international development efforts.

So for these and many other reasons, which will be in my extended remarks, I urge our colleagues to vote against what I believe to be the unwise, counterproductive, and ultimately destructive cuts in our Nation's foreign assistance budget contained in this bill. These programs work. Combating rapid population growth, enhancing maternal health, ensuring child survival, reducing the spread of disease, providing basic education and improving agriculture and sustainable development are some of the most humane, far-sighted, and economically effective efforts we can undertake. Maintaining adequate funding for these programs now will save many times its expense in future U.S. foreign assistance, will promote global peace and security, and will promote and protect U.S. foreign policy interests. I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of exponential population growth, combined with unsustainable patterns of consumption, is also evident in mounting signs of stress on the world's environment. Under conditions of rapid population growth, renewable resources are being used faster than they can be replaced. Other environmental consequences of the world's burgeoning population are tropical deforestation, erosion of arable land and watersheds, extinction of plant and animal species, and pollution of air, water, and land.

For almost 30 years, population assistance has been a central component of U.S. development assistance. While much more remains to be done, population assistance has had a significant positive impact on the health of women and their children and on society as a whole in most countries. In many parts of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, fertility rates have decreased, often dramatically. Couples are succeeding in having the smaller families they want because of the greater availability of contraceptives that our assistance has made possible.

Today, approximately 55 percent of couples worldwide use modern methods of contraception, compared with 10 percent in the 1960's. Despite this impressive increase in contraceptive use, the demand for family planning services is growing, in large measure because populations are growing. Indeed, over the next 20 years, the number of women and men who wish to use contraception will almost double.

Similarly, population assistance has contributed to the significant progress that has been made in reducing infant and child mortality rates. Child survival is integrally linked to women's reproductive health, and specifically to a mother's timing, spacing and number of births. Despite substantial progress, a large proportion of children in the developing

world—particularly in sub-Saharan Africa and some Asian countries—still die in infancy.

And, while many countries in the developing world have succeeded in reducing maternal mortality rates, the incidence of maternal death and disability remains unacceptably high, constituting a serious public health problem facing most developing countries. According to the World Health Organization, an estimated 500,000 women die every year as a result of pregnancy and childbirth.

U.S. population assistance is preventive medicine on an international scale. Congress has long recognized this to be the case and over the years has reaffirmed the importance of population assistance in securing U.S. interests abroad. By addressing the basic health and educational needs of women and their families, population assistance provides building blocks for strong democratic government and sets the stage for economic growth. Furthermore, it helps prevent social and political crises, thereby averting the need for costly relief efforts.

At the International Conference on Population and Development [ICPD], held in Cairo last year, the United States was instrumental in building a broad consensus behind a comprehensive Program of Action, which was signed by almost all of the 180 countries that participate in the conference, and which will help guide the population and development programs of the United Nations and national governments into the next century. Central to this plan is the recognition that with adequate funding this decade for family planning and reproductive health services, as well as educational, economic, and social opportunities necessary to enhance the status of women, we can stabilize world population in the first half of the next century.

This bill, however, seems to abandon the goals of the ICPD and the international community. Throughout the Bush administration, and in the last two budgets, the President and Congress have seen fit to increase funding for population assistance, believing strongly that population funding is one of the most cost effective and important uses of our foreign aid dollars. In fact, I recently submitted a letter to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] with the signatures over 100 of our colleagues, urging the committee to fund population programs at the level requested by the President—\$635 million.

Instead, the Appropriations Committee has recommended reducing population funding to roughly \$300 million, and eliminating the population and development account all together.

These significant cuts in population programs will have devastating and irreversible consequences for the future course of fertility decline in developing countries. The effects of a 50 percent population funding reduction will be felt most immediately in the health and well-being of women and children in developing countries, but will also be felt by the larger global community. Without these funds, there will likely be an estimated 1.6 million unwanted pregnancies per year, resulting in 1.2 million unwanted births, more than 350,000 abortions, and 8,000 maternal deaths.

In addition to these sharp reductions in population assistance, related programs for maternal health, disease prevention, general education, agricultural improvement and rural development will be devastated by the cuts in this bill. Although the Appropriations Committee

has quite laudably attempted to place an emphasis on helping the world's children, this bill would cut many of the programs that will benefit children the most. It contains large cuts in maternal health—\$50 million—in efforts to strengthen health care systems which deliver services to both children and adults—\$88 million—and in water sanitation programs—\$27 million.

Of these proposed cuts, one of the most startling and destructive is the reduction for maternal health. In the set of 18 countries central to USAID's goal of reducing maternal mortality, drastic reductions in the funding for delivery of safe pregnancy services will contribute to an estimated 24,000 maternal deaths annually that would have been otherwise averted. In addition to these preventable maternal deaths, an additional 336,000 stillbirths and early newborn deaths are likely to occur as a result of USAID's virtual withdrawal from this program. Finally, the delivery of safe pregnancy and related services not only averts maternal deaths, it also helps to avert long-term—chronic—disabilities that occur due to pregnancy and childbirth. In these 18 key countries, estimates of the number of pregnancy-related chronic disabilities are as high as 7 million annually.

I would also like to say a few words about the Smith amendment to this bill, which has been granted a waiver in the rule for violating the prohibition against legislating in an appropriations bill.

Aside from the fact that this waiver is strongly opposed by the chairman of the International Relations Committee, Mr. GILMAN, and should not have been granted, the Smith amendment will deny millions of women access to family planning, prenatal care, safe delivery services, maternal and infant health programs, treatments for infertility, and STD prevention services. It could result in over hundreds of thousands of abortions that could have been averted had these women had access to basic health services.

Contrary to what Mr. SMITH and other proponents of this amendment will argue, this is not about abortion—it is about family planning, and the fact that this amendment will cut population assistance funding to its lowest level in 25 years, when adjusted for inflation. The fact remains that U.S. funds do not pay for abortions. For over 20 years, under the Helms amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, Federal law has prohibited any U.S. funds from being used for abortions, or to promote abortion. H.R. 1868 retains this prohibition.

The proponents of this amendment also claim that it simply restores anti-abortion policies of the Reagan administration. But it goes further than the so-called Mexico City policy, which prohibited funding to organizations that perform abortion with private funds. It also targets the political messages of family planning providers. It would prevent organizations that receive U.S. population assistance from using their non-U.S. funds in efforts to influence their own country's abortion law, either for or against. Thus, although it is already illegal to use U.S. funds to lobby, groups on both sides of the abortion issue would be penalized for exercising their rights to express their views on abortion.

Finally, Mr. SMITH, in past debates, has misstated the role and involvement of the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA] in China. No one disagrees that the coercive Chinese

population program is abhorrent, and the UNFPA in fact categorically condemns the use of coercion in any form or manner in any population program, including China. Mr. SMITH has said that the UNFPA cannot say enough good things about the Chinese program, and that China could not ask for a better front than the UNFPA. But Mr. SMITH relies on a 1989 quote from UNFPA executive director, Dr. Nafis Sadik, that was taken out of context, at a time when the Chinese seemed to be making progress towards improving the program. The fact is that no evidence has ever been presented of complicity by international agencies, including the UNFPA, in Chinese human rights abuses and, as confirmed by USAID during the Reagan administration, UNFPA does not fund abortion or support coercive practices in any country, including China.

Mr. SMITH's amendment ignores the benefits of the UNFPA's presence in China and over 140 other countries. One of the reasons the international community has information about the horrors of the Chinese program is because of the presence in China of international organizations such as the UNFPA. Moreover, many countries believe that by providing assistance to China, UNFPA is in a unique position to positively influence China's population policies and to promote human rights. UNFPA is in constant dialog with Chinese officials at every level on matters pertaining to human rights, and UNFPA's programs expose Chinese officials to international standards through international training in foreign institutions, including several United States universities. Moreover, denying funding to the UNFPA would have a drastic effect on the UNFPA's programs in the rest of the world. Nearly half of UNFPA assistance is used for family planning services and maternal and child health care in the poorest and most remote regions of the world.

Mr. Speaker, for these and other reasons, I urge our colleagues to vote against the unwise, counterproductive, and ultimately destructive cuts in our Nation's foreign assistance budget contained in this bill. These programs work. Combating rapid population growth, enhancing maternal health, insuring child survival, reducing the spread of disease, providing basic education, and improving agriculture and sustainable development are some of the most humane, farsighted and economically effective efforts we can undertake. Maintaining adequate funding for these programs now will save many times this expense in future U.S. foreign assistance, will greatly reduce human suffering, will promote global peace and security and will promote and protect U.S. foreign policy interests.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and on the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask for an accounting on the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the yielding of time, because I

want to rise in support of the rule that is pending, largely because it will be accommodating an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] at a later point in the proceedings, which will seek to modify the behavior of the Turkish Government vis-a-vis the Kurds and the record of human rights violations that has become replete over the last few years.

I would not pay so much attention to it as an individual Member of the Congress as I normally would, except that this record, attached to the Turkish behavior with the Kurds, is only but the latest of other reported, documented, and severe human violations perpetrated by the Turkish Government previously, and next to the current government, in Cyprus, for instance. There we are in the untenable position of furnishing aid to a government which turns American weapons, as it were, on to the Cypriot population, and commits human rights violations there using American money and guns.

Now, the United Nations took note of that. The international community, even on the floor of the Congress, there was commentary after commentary and action after action taken at those particular times. But now there is just too much. We cannot tolerate this kind of behavior anymore.

The Kurds' situation allows us to begin to modify the behavior of Turkey with respect to that segment of the world. I have heard the gentleman from Florida, who wants to modify behavior in Haiti through this amendment process. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] seeks to conduct or help conduct foreign policy with respect to Haiti with the elections that are pending there. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] seeks to modify, along with the help of the gentleman from Florida, the issue of Russia and Cuba and a nuclear reactor.

I ask those individuals and all the remaining Members on the floor of the House and in their offices to pay attention to this particular vital issue on the Porter amendment, which can bring about a better future for the Kurds and to begin to curb the human rights violations perpetrated for decades now by the Government of Turkey.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about the careful tailoring in this rule for various interests, but we have not heard a word about the vastly popular deficit reduction lockbox. This is the third appropriations bill we are considering, and the third time the Committee on Rules has not make the lockbox in order. For that reason, I rise in opposition to this rule.

The lockbox is widely popular here; 418 votes to 5 passed it as part of the

rescissions bill. All members of the Committee on Rules voted for it. Most of America wants it. It is our best available tool now to make sure that money cut from these appropriations bills goes to deficit reduction.

Just yesterday we passed the military construction appropriations bill. We cut over \$20 million from that bill in floor amendments. None of that money will go to deficit reduction. All of it will be reprogrammed. That is wrong.

The rule is wrong too. The lockbox should be in order. The lockbox should be in order under the rule on every appropriations bill, and should be passed, as most Members of this House wanted it to as an amendment to the budget act.

So vote "no" on this rule and vote for the bipartisan Brewster-Harman deficit lockbox.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly oppose the rule we are considering for the Foreign Operations bill today. I have great respect for the chairman of our Committee on rules and great respect for the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee and for the good work that he has done to try to find common ground in the bill, and I support the bill. But I cannot support a rule that will waive points of order against an amendment that is pure authorizing language and that will effectively gut our country's bilateral and multilateral population programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Smith amendment has no place in this bill. I am, frankly, very surprised it was made in order under the rule. A nearly identical Smith amendment was adopted during consideration of the foreign aid authorizing bill earlier this year. While I disagreed with the amendment then and spoke out against it, I did not question the Member's right to offer it at the time. That was the appropriate bill and the correct forum for that debate.

But now, however, the Committee on Rules has given extraordinary consideration to those who oppose voluntary family planning by making this amendment in order on a totally inappropriate bill. This is, in my judgment, not fair, since the bill as reported contains no funds whatsoever for abortion, no funds whatsoever for China. The Smith amendment confirms this, but goes further to gut the voluntary family planning programs in the bill, harming millions of couples around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have the highest respect for the gentleman from New Jersey, who is my friend and colleague. And he and I and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] in fact are joining together on the amendment that the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] mentioned, the fact that we are aiding a country that is committing genocide against its Kurdish population. Mr. SMITH and Mr. WOLF and I are joining together to offer an amendment that will cut aid to Turkey, who is committing genocide against its Kurdish population, is preventing our aid from reaching our allies in Armenia, and is continuing its 21 year occupation of the Island of Cyprus and its intransigence in helping to reunite that island as a country.

So I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. But, very frankly, his amendment does not belong on this piece of legislation. For that reason, I would urge the Members to send this rule back to the Committee on Rules for rewriting, and will have to oppose the rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the majority and minority of the Committee on Rules for allowing three amendments that I will be offering on a bipartisan basis. I also wish to thank Mr. CALLAHAN and Mr. OBEY and their staffs for their assistance in helping me deal with these amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the open rule that we will be debating allows an open debate on the harsh realities that exist today in Burma. My most recent trip to that country was extremely disappointing on account of the Burmese regime's entrenchment on human rights and democratization efforts. As a result of this entrenchment I will be offering two amendments with the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] intended to further isolate this repressive regime by cutting all counternarcotics assistance and providing additional funds for the refugee crisis along both sides of the Thai-Burma border.

Burma's ruling military government has established itself as unquestionably the heavyweight champion of repressive governments by violating human rights and detaining the leader of Burma's Democrat movement, Aung San Suu Kyi, for the past 6 years. She courageously is in house arrest without any kind of prospects for being released. Recent efforts to obtain visas by the authors of this amendment have either been denied or granted only after preconditions were met. Leading opposition members of the National League for Democracy in Burma were arrested after I met with them last month.

Perhaps as the most egregious of all human rights violations, Dr. Michael Aris, Aung San Suu Kyi's husband, has been denied access to his imprisoned wife. Just last week the International

Committee for the Red Cross abandoned efforts to work with the Burmese Government because of unacceptable conditions imposed by the SLORC on the activities of the Red Cross. So, after permitting the Red Cross to come in to inspect prisons in Burma, they were thrown out.

What we have here is a case of a policy that right now is moving in the direction of dealing with the heroin crisis. That is important. But it does not mean that this administration or any administration should reward a repressive regime with counternarcotics assistance. The amendment that I will be offering with the support of many Members of the majority and minority hopefully will make sure that this does not happen.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude with a discussion of the refugee crisis from both sides of the Thai-Burma border that is worsening. The launching of an offensive against the Karen refugees this spring resulted in an outflow of an estimated additional 20,000 refugees to Thailand, bringing the population there to over 90,000.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from the State of Florida, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman CALLAHAN, and especially Bill Engle from the chairman's staff, for their great help on this very important bill. The Menendez amendment which was granted a waiver from the Committee on Rules is a correct one and not a narrow interest amendment, because I believe that we must use all of the instruments at our disposal to pressure the Russian Government to immediately halt their intentions of aiding the Communist regime of Fidel Castro in finishing construction of the Juragua nuclear powerplant in Cienfuegos, Cuba. If completed, this nuclear plant will pose a serious threat to the safety of the United States, Central America, and the Caribbean.

Construction of the Juragua nuclear plant was halted in 1992 after the Castro regime was not able to obtain the foreign exchange necessary to finish construction. However, this past May, Russia and Cuba announced their intention to finish construction of this plant.

Completion of this nuclear powerplant could constitute the introduction of a real and permanent threat to the health and safety of our hemisphere. Numerous experts, including former technicians at the plant now living in the United States, have denounced its inadequate construction, as well as inferior equipment that was used in its construction. Moreover, the General Accounting Office reported allegations in 1992 that the Juragua nuclear plant was unsafe, and similar Soviet style

plants in Eastern Europe have already suffered accidents. In fact, four such plants were shut down by the German Government after reunification of that country.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this type of threat to the security of the United States to be present just a few hundred miles from our shores, especially in the hands of a totalitarian tyrant like Fidel Castro, who has no respect for the dignity of human life.

□ 1630

We must pressure the Government of Russia to stop helping the Castro regime in finishing construction of this nuclear plant. There are several amendments presented in this bill to accomplish this. Do our constituents want their tax dollars to build a Chernobyl-style nuclear facility just miles from the coast of the United States? Do our constituents want an unsafe nuclear reactor operated by one of the last Communist strongholds being built with U.S. funds? I think the answer clearly is "no."

The Committee on Rules was correct in granting the waiver, and I urge a "yes" vote on this rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express concern about a provision that has been included in this bill which would effectively change existing law through the appropriations process. The provision, which was put in the bill in the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, would severely weaken section 907 of the Freedom Support Act of 1992. This provision bans direct United States Government assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan until Azerbaijan lifts its blockade of neighboring Armenia. This law made good sense when it was adopted 3 years ago in the wake of the breakup of the Soviet Union. It is morally justified and in U.S. interests. It should not be gutted through the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, the Azerbaijan blockade of Armenia has continued for 5 years, cutting off the transport of food, fuel, medicine, and other commodities. This ruthless blockade has caused a humanitarian crisis that has required the United States to send emergency assistance to Armenia. At a time when Armenia is trying to move forward with major market reforms and integrating its economy with the West, the Azerbaijan stranglehold has forced a shutdown of Armenian industry, caused massive unemployment, and obstructed rebuilding of areas damaged by the 1988 earthquake. Armenian children have had to do without schooling, and hospitals have been unable to care for the sick and the dying. There is no justification for this type of behavior. American taxpayers should not be asked to reward or appease these actions by Azerbaijan.

On the positive side, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Foreign Ops Subcommittee, and in particular the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for the inclusion in the legislation of language incorporating the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. This provision would deny U.S. assistance to countries which block the shipment of American humanitarian aid to other countries. This has been the case with the Republic of Turkey, which has maintained its own blockade of Armenia while collecting generous amounts of United States aid. Mr. Speaker, I think common sense and decency would argue that countries that block U.S. aid to other recipients should not themselves benefit from American largesse. I commend the committee for including this language, which was also part of the American Overseas Interests Act, and would urge Members to oppose any efforts to remove this provision.

I also understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has also an amendment to limit assistance to Turkey in part linked to its blockade of Armenia. I would also urge support of this amendment.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would point out that some of the discussion has been talked about with regard to Haiti and Turkey and so forth. We are talking about cutting amendments, and we do have an open rule. So that is in the area of the spirit of things that are traditional and available to any Member under this type of legislation, as we all know, nothing really extraordinary there. And the fact that we have an open rule on an appropriations bill, I think, is very important for the deliberative process, something we promised we would do as often as possible.

With regard to the concern of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], on the Smith amendment, indeed we have not followed exactly the authorizing language because we did pass an authorizing bill and that is what we want to follow.

With regard to the concern of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], about the lockbox, she needs to know that we are dealing with that issue. We have planned debate and hearings and so forth, and she has been advised that she will be invited to participate.

So there is process in the legislative mill. It just does not happen to be ready yet for the appropriations round that we are in now. Many of us wish it were. I hope we get there soon. We are trying.

Finally, I think a very important point on this rule, I do not think anybody has really suggested this is not fair rule, but I would point out that last year the Committee on Rules, this was under the previous majority, the Committee on Rules made in order

only eight amendments on this appropriations bill, five by Republicans and three by Democrats. We thanked them for those five. The rule waived all points of order against all eight amendments. By our count, five of the eight involved violations of clause 2 of rule XXI. So if your concern is that, we are definitely making progress and doing a better job of getting our authorizers and appropriators in sync. I think that is important. I think it makes for a better product and an easier vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 178, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

YEAS—221

Allard	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Archer	Cunningham	Hancock
Armey	Davis	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Deal	Hayworth
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Hefley
Baker (LA)	Deutsch	Heineman
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Barr	Dickey	Hilleary
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Hobson
Bartlett	Dornan	Hoekstra
Barton	Dreier	Hoke
Bass	Duncan	Horn
Bateman	Dunn	Hostettler
Bereuter	Ehlers	Hunter
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Bliley	Emerson	Hyde
Blute	English	Inglis
Boehlert	Ensign	Johnson (CT)
Boehner	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Ewing	Jones
Bono	Fawell	Kasich
Brownback	Fields (TX)	Kelly
Bryant (TN)	Flanagan	Kim
Bunn	Foley	King
Bunning	Forbes	Klug
Burr	Ford	Knollenberg
Buyer	Fowler	Kolbe
Callahan	Fox	LaHood
Calvert	Franks (CT)	Largent
Camp	Franks (NJ)	Latham
Canady	Frelinghuysen	Lazio
Castle	Frisa	Leach
Chabot	Funderburk	Lewis (CA)
Chambliss	Gallely	Lewis (KY)
Chenoweth	Ganske	Lightfoot
Christensen	Gekas	Linder
Clinger	Gilchrest	Livingston
Coble	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Coburn	Gilman	Longley
Collins (GA)	Goodlatte	Lucas
Combust	Goodling	Manzullo
Cooley	Goss	Martinez
Cox	Greenwood	Martini
Crapo	Gunderson	McCollum
Cremeans	Gutknecht	McCrery

McInnis	Riggs
McIntosh	Roberts
McKeon	Rogers
Menendez	Rohrabacher
Metcalfe	Ros-Lehtinen
Meyers	Roth
Miller (FL)	Roukema
Molinari	Royce
Moorhead	Salmon
Morrell	Sanford
Myers	Saxton
Myrick	Scarborough
Nethercutt	Schaefer
Neumann	Schiff
Ney	Sensenbrenner
Norwood	Shadegg
Nussle	Shaw
Oxley	Shays
Packard	Shuster
Paxon	Skeen
Petri	Smith (MI)
Pombo	Smith (NJ)
Porter	Smith (TX)
Portman	Smith (WA)
Quillen	Solomon
Quinn	Souder
Radanovich	Spence
Ramstad	Stearns
Regula	Stockman

NAYS—178

Abercrombie	Gordon
Andrews	Green
Bailes	Gutierrez
Baldacci	Hall (OH)
Barcia	Hamilton
Barrett (WI)	Harman
Becerra	Hastings (FL)
Beilenson	Hayes
Bentsen	Hefner
Berman	Hilliard
Bevill	Hinchey
Bishop	Holden
Bonior	Hoyer
Borski	Jackson-Lee
Boucher	Jacobs
Brewster	Johnson (SD)
Browder	Johnson, E.B.
Brown (CA)	Johnston
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski
Brown (OH)	Kaptur
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (MA)
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)
Chapman	Kennelly
Clay	Kildee
Clement	Klecza
Clyburn	Klink
Coleman	Lantos
Collins (IL)	Lewis (GA)
Collins (MI)	Lincoln
Condit	Lipinski
Conyers	Lofgren
Costello	Luther
Coyne	Maloney
Cramer	Manton
Danner	Markey
de la Garza	Mascara
DeLauro	Matsui
Dellums	Dicks
Dicks	McCarthy
Dingell	McDermott
Dixon	McHale
Doggett	McKinney
Doyle	McNulty
Durbin	Meehan
Edwards	Meek
Engel	Mfume
Eshoo	Miller (CA)
Evans	Mineta
Farr	Minge
Fattah	Mink
Fazio	Mollohan
Fields (LA)	Montgomery
Filner	Moran
Flake	Murtha
Foglietta	Nadler
Frank (MA)	Neal
Furse	Oberstar
Gephardt	Obey
Gibbons	Olver
Gonzalez	Ortiz

NOT VOTING—35

DeFazio	Hansen
Dooly	Hastert
Frost	Houghton
Gejdenson	Istook
Geren	Jefferson
Graham	Kingston

LaFalce	Mica
LaTourette	Moakley
Laughlin	Parker
Levin	Payne (VA)
McDade	Pryce
McHugh	Rose

Seastrand
Serrano
Stupak
Tate
Torres

□ 1656

Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. VOLKMER changed their vote for “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 175, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—217

Allard	Everett	Lightfoot
Archer	Ewing	Linder
Armey	Fawell	Livingston
Bachus	Fields (TX)	LoBiondo
Baker (CA)	Flanagan	Longley
Baker (LA)	Foley	Lucas
Ballenger	Forbes	Manzullo
Barr	Fowler	Martini
Barrett (NE)	Fox	McCollum
Bartlett	Franks (CT)	McCrery
Bass	Franks (NJ)	McInnis
Bateman	Frelinghuysen	McIntosh
Bereuter	Frisa	McKeon
Bilirakis	Funderburk	Menendez
Bliley	Gallely	Metcalfe
Blute	Ganske	Meyers
Boehlert	Gekas	Miller (FL)
Boehner	Gilchrest	Molinari
Bonilla	Gillmor	Moorhead
Bono	Gilman	Murtha
Brownback	Goodlatte	Myers
Bryant (TN)	Goodling	Myrick
Bunn	Goss	Nethercutt
Bunning	Green	Neumann
Burr	Greenwood	Ney
Buyer	Gunderson	Norwood
Callahan	Gutknecht	Nussle
Calvert	Hall (OH)	Oxley
Camp	Hancock	Packard
Canady	Hastings (WA)	Paxon
Castle	Hayworth	Petri
Chabot	Hefley	Pombo
Chambliss	Heineman	Portman
Chenoweth	Herger	Quillen
Christensen	Hilleary	Quinn
Clinger	Hobson	Radanovich
Coble	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Coburn	Hoke	Regula
Collins (GA)	Horn	Richardson
Combust	Hostettler	Riggs
Cooley	Hunter	Roberts
Cox	Hutchinson	Rogers
Crapo	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Cremeans	Inglis	Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin	Jacobs	Roth
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Davis	Jones	Royce
Deal	Kasich	Salmon
DeLay	Kelly	Sanford
Deutsch	Kim	Saxton
Diaz-Balart	King	Scarborough
Dickey	Klug	Schaefer
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Schiff
Dreier	Kolbe	Schumer
Dunn	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Ehlers	Latham	Shadegg
Ehrlich	Lazio	Shaw
Emerson	Leach	Shuster
English	Lewis (CA)	Sisisky
Ensign	Lewis (KY)	Skeen

Smith (MI)	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Tiahrt	Weldon (PA)
Smith (TX)	Torkildsen	Weller
Smith (WA)	Torricelli	White
Solomon	Trafigant	Whitfield
Souder	Upton	Wicker
Spence	Vento	Wolf
Stearns	Vucanovich	Young (AK)
Stockman	Waldholtz	Young (FL)
Stump	Walker	Zeliff
Talent	Walsh	Zimmer
Taylor (NC)	Wamp	
Thomas	Watts (OK)	

NOES—175

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Ortiz
Andrews	Gonzalez	Orton
Baesler	Gordon	Owens
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Pallone
Barcia	Hall (TX)	Payne (NJ)
Barrett (WI)	Hamilton	Pelosi
Becerra	Harman	Peterson (FL)
Beilenson	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Bentsen	Hayes	Pickett
Berman	Hefner	Pomeroy
Bevill	Hilliard	Porter
Bishop	Hinchev	Poshard
Bonior	Holden	Rahall
Borski	Hoyer	Rangel
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Reed
Brewster	Johnson (CT)	Reynolds
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E.B.	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Rush
Bryant (TX)	Kaptur	Sabo
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Chapman	Kennelly	Sawyer
Clay	Kildee	Schroeder
Clement	Klink	Scott
Clyburn	Lantos	Shays
Coleman	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Collins (IL)	Lincoln	Skelton
Collins (MI)	Lipinski	Slaughter
Condit	Lofgren	Spratt
Conyers	Lowe	Stark
Costello	Luther	Stenholm
Coyne	Maloney	Stokes
Cramer	Manton	Studds
Danner	Markey	Tanner
de la Garza	Martinez	Tauzin
DeLauro	Mascara	Taylor (MS)
Dellums	Matsui	Tejeda
Dicks	McCarthy	Thompson
Dingell	McDermott	Thornton
Dixon	McHale	Thurman
Doggett	McKinney	Towns
Duncan	McNulty	Tucker
Durbin	Meehan	Velázquez
Edwards	Meek	Viscosky
Engel	Mfume	Volkmer
Eshoo	Miller (CA)	Ward
Evans	Mineta	Waters
Farr	Minge	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Mink	Waxman
Fazio	Mollohan	Williams
Fields (LA)	Montgomery	Wilson
Filner	Moran	Wise
Flake	Morella	Woolsey
Foglietta	Nadler	Wyden
Ford	Neal	Wynn
Frank (MA)	Oberstar	Yates
Furse	Obey	
Gephardt	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—42

Ackerman	Graham	McDade
Barton	Hansen	McHugh
Bilbray	Hastert	Mica
Burton	Houghton	Moakley
Chrysler	Istook	Parker
Clayton	Jefferson	Pastor
Crane	Kennedy (MA)	Payne (VA)
DeFazio	Kingston	Pryce
Dooley	Klecza	Rose
Dornan	LaFalce	Seastrand
Doyle	Largent	Serrano
Frost	LaTourette	Stupak
Gejdenson	Laughlin	Tate
Gerren	Levin	Torres

□ 1705

Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. NADLER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader to inquire about the schedule for next week.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 26, the House will meet in pro forma session. There will be no recorded votes on Monday.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and 12 noon for legislative business. We plan to consider one bill under suspension of the rules, H.R. 1565, legislation extending health care to veterans who have been exposed to Agent Orange. We will then continue consideration of H.R. 1868, the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to take up House Joint Resolution 79, a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment prohibiting desecration of the U.S. flag, subject to a rule. We then plan to spend the balance of the week working on appropriations bills. We will complete the foreign operations legislation and, time permitting, consider the fiscal year 1996 energy and water, Interior, and Agriculture appropriations bills. On Thursday and Friday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, it is our hope to have Members on their way home to their families and their districts by no later than 3 p.m. on Friday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will answer a question or two here. I wonder if the gentleman can advise Members how late he expects the House to work on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the Members should be prepared to work very late on all three of those evenings, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

I would point out that we are prepared and hopeful that we can during next week deal with a budget conference report, perhaps the Medicare select report, and hopefully we would be able to do something on a rescissions or supplemental assistance bill.

Mr. GEPHARDT. On that score, on an earlier version of the schedule provided by the majority, the rescissions bill was listed. It is not on the schedule that you just outlined. You just mentioned it. I assume that you are thinking it might come forward as well next week?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, we are still hopeful to have some continued discussions with the White House, but I believe that it is very likely that we will be able to do that next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. The Committee on Rules is scheduled to meet on Tuesday to consider a rule regarding the constitutional amendment on the flag. Could the gentleman or the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules advise Members what rule is expected for that resolution?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would say to the minority leader that the Committee on Rules will be meeting, I believe, at 2 p.m. on Tuesday afternoon. The Interior appropriations bill has been pulled from that meeting and we will only consider the constitutional amendment that would allow States to ban the physical desecration of the American flag. It certainly will come to the floor under a rule and probably with 1 hour of debate and some time for a substitute by those that might be in opposition to the bill. We are in negotiation now as to just exactly how the rule would be brought to the floor.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

A couple of further questions. Could the gentleman advise Members as to when he expects the House to consider the budget conference report? I think he answered that and said it might be coming forward next week. I assume at this point you are not sure of that, but it could happen?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, we are optimistic and we would hope if everything comes together that we might be able to do that on Thursday. Possibly Friday morning.

However it works, we will do our utmost to maintain our commitment to the 3 p.m. departure for the district work period. But I should expect it would be Thursday or Friday morning.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Finally, at the end of the week, we begin the Fourth of July recess.

Could the gentleman advise Members whether he expects votes on Monday, July 10?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe we would probably need to be prepared to have votes by, say, 5 p.m. on Monday, July 10. We will try to examine that and make an announcement later next week if there is any change from that.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would just end with one statement for consideration. I know the gentleman is trying, as we said this morning, to have a family friendly situation here and that was part of the reason I assume we had problems with cutting off times on votes. We appreciate that.

I would just hope that if it can be worked out next week if there is one of the nights next week that could not be extra late, that might be helpful to